

19-8480

No. _____

ORIGINAL

IN THE

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Stan J. Caterbone

(Your Name)

PETITIONER

vs.

The NSA

— RESPONDENT(S)

FILED

MAR 10 2020

OFFICE OF THE CLERK
SUPREME COURT, U.S.

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO

U.S. Third Circuit Court of Appeals

(NAME OF COURT THAT LAST RULED ON MERITS OF YOUR CASE)

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Stan J. Caterbone

(Your Name)

1250 Fremont Street

(Address)

LANCASTER, PA 17603

(City, State, Zip Code)

(617) 327-1566

(Phone Number)

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

QUESTION NUMBER ONE: Is there Judicial Misconduct and Abuse of Authority and are the courts attempting to hide the fact that there are abuses by the military and intelligence agencies, possibly originating out of the National Security Agency, or NSA including COITELPRO operations – and still going on today – all of which entail numerous violations of the U.S. Constitution? PETITIONER Stan J. Caterbone has provided substantial supporting evidence, especially considering U.S. District Court Judge Jeffrey Schmehl's Opinion which states and the U.S. Third Circuit Court of Appeals upheld

"As noted above, Caterbone has a history of filing numerous frivolous complaints regarding his allegations of government mind-control in this Court. In light of that history, the Court places Caterbone on notice that further baseless filings may result in restriction of his filing privileges. See *Abdul-Akbar v. Watson*, 901 F.2d 329,333 (3d Cir. 1990) ("When a district court is confronted with a pattern of conduct from which it can only conclude that a litigant is intentionally abusing the judicial process and will continue to do so unless restrained, we believe it is entitled to resort to its power of injunction and contempt to protect its process."). An appropriate Order follows. Additionally any second amended complaint shall, as clearly and briefly as possible, state the factual basis for Caterbone's claims against each defendant, state the basis for the Court's jurisdiction over the claim, and state the relief that Caterbone seeks from this Court. Caterbone should not reassert any claims regarding the government's mind control over him or other claims that the Court has determined to be factually frivolous. If Caterbone files a second amended complaint, the Clerk of Court should not make service until so ORDERED "

ANSWER TO QUESTION NUMBER ONE: YES

LIST OF PARTIES

[X] All parties appear in the caption of the case on the cover page.

[] All parties do not appear in the caption of the case on the cover page. A list of all parties to the proceeding in the court whose judgment is the subject of this petition is as follows:

LIST OF PLAINTIFF-APPELLANTS

- 1. STAN J. CATERBONE**

LIST OF RESPONDENTS

- 1. The National Security Agency, or NSA, represented by
Noel J. Francisco
Counsel of Record
Solicitor General
United States Department of Justice
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530-0001
SupremeCtBriefs@USDOJ.gov
202-514-2217**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PAGE No.

PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI	1
PROOF OF SERVICE	3
(3) QUESTIONS OF WRIT	4
LIST OF PARTIES	5
TABLE OF CONTENTS	6
JURISDICTION	7
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES	9
STATEMENT OF THE CASE	14
REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT	19
CONCLUSION	38

INDEX TO APPENDICES

APPENDIX A – OPINIONS BELOW

APPENDIX B – The United Nations Special Rapporteur for TORTURE

APPENDIX C - Resume

APPENDIX D – Pending Court Cases of Petitioner Stan J. Caterbone

APPENDIX E – 1972 DIA Report and Apprehensions

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED

CASES

Page No.

351 F.3d 1348 (2003)

Robert S. WOLFF, Edward Turner, Edward E. Waller, Grey Wolf
Holdings, John G. Coughlin,
Plaintiffs-Appellees,

v.

CASH 4 TITLES, d.b.a. Charles Richard Homa, et al., Defendants,
Phillip S. Stenger, G. James Cleaver, Cayman Islands Liquidations
Creditors' Committee,
Appellants.

No. 01-16973.

ELEVENTH CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS

Filed December 5, 2003.

STATUTES

1. PRO SE & IN FORMA PAUPERIS

Commonwealth v. Haggentstaller, 699 A. 2d 767 (Pa Superior, 1997), Pro Se Appellant sought review of Conviction for violation of County for violation of County ordinance with Rule of Appellant Procedure, court conducted a "thorough, independent review of the record", and found sufficient evidence to sustain the conviction.

Hempfield Township v. Hapchuck 153 Pa. Comwlth. 173620 A. 2d. 668 (1993) Pro Se Brief failed to comply with Pa. Rules of Appellate Procedure, but the failure to comply did not substantially impede the Courts ability to review the issues presented and therefore considered the merits of the case.

Pa. R. App. P. Rule 552, 561 Indigent § 16.2 In Forma Pauperis, Griffen v. Illinois, 351 U.S. 12, 76 S. Ct. 585, 100 L. Ed. 891 (1956) states Indigent has right to free Trial Transcript for Appeal of Right.

In Pederson v. South Williamsport Area School District, the courts interpreted due process, as "Essentially fundamental fairness is exactly what due process means". Furthermore, the United States District Courts in Perry v. Coyer (1978, 524 F 2d. 644) have concluded the following: "Even the probability of unfairness can result in a defendant being deprived of his due process rights...".

The first issue to address is that of the Plaintiff's right to due process, as prescribed by law. In *Pederson v. South Williamsport Area School District*, the courts interpreted due process, as "Essentially fundamental fairness is exactly what due process means". Furthermore, the United States District Courts in *Perry v. Coyer* (1978, 524 F 2d. 644) have concluded the following: "Even the probability of unfairness can result in a defendant being deprived of his due process rights...".

2. CIVIL RIGHTS

§1983 Civil Rights Acts and 18 U.S.C.A. Acts state the following: "The underlying purpose of the scheme of protecting constitutional rights are to permit victims of constitutional violations to obtain redress, to provide for federal prosecution of serious constitutional violations when state criminal proceedings are ineffective for purpose of deterring violations and to strike a balance between protection of individual rights from state infringement and protection from state and local government from federal interference", 18 U.S.C.A. §§ 241, 242; U.S.C.A. – Const. Art. 2, 53; Amend. 13, 14, 5, 15, § 2: 42 U.S.C.A. §§ 1981-1982, 1985, 1988, Fed. Rules Civil Proc. Rule 28, U.S.C.A.

In *Ascolese v. Southeastern Turnpike Authority*, C 925 F. supp. 351, the case supports the notion that "One of the principal purposes of § 1983 was to give remedy to parties deprived of Constitutional Rights, privileges, and immunities by Official's abuse of his or her position, that is to provide remedy against individual officials who violate Constitutional Rights, 42 U.S.C.A. § 1983.

3. CIVIL CONSPIRACY

Rico §263 42 § 1985 (2) Persons Involved In Litigation To Be Free From Conspiracy

In the case of *United States v. Holck*, 389 F. Supp. 2d. 338, criminal responsibility defines single or multiple conspiracies by the following: "Governments, without committing variance between single conspiracy charges in an indictment and it's proof at trial may establish existence at continuing core conspiracy which attracts different members at different times and which involves different subgroups committing acts in furtherance of an overall plan". This illustrates the legal analysis of the 1987 conspiracy to cover-up my International Signal & Control, Plc., whistle blowing activities.

Under Pennsylvania Law, conspiracy may be proved by circumstantial evidence that is by acts and circumstances sufficient to warrant an inference that the unlawful combination has been in front of facts formed for the purpose charged. See *Walcker v. North Wales Boro*, 395 F. Supp. 2d. 219. In the same case the following was supported: "Arrestee's allegations that the township (Conestoga) and it's police officers were acting in concert and conspiracy and with the purpose of violating arrestee's constitutional rights by subjecting him to unreasonable force, arrest, search, and malicious prosecution and the two (2) or more

officers acted together in throwing arrestee to the ground (April 5th, 2006 and August 4th, 2006) and forcing him to take two (2) blood tests and holding him in custody". The preceding pleaded civil conspiracy claims under Pennsylvania Law.

In order to state a claim for civil conspiracy and a cause of action under Pennsylvania Law, a plaintiff must allege that two (2) or more persons agree or combine with lawful intent to do an unlawful act or to do an otherwise lawful act by unlawful means, with proof of malice with intent to injure the person, his/her property and or business. In the case of *United States v. Holck*, 389 F. Supp. 2d. 338, criminal responsibility defines single or multiple conspiracies by the following: "Governments, without committing variance between single conspiracy charges in an indictment and it's proof at trial may establish existence at continuing core conspiracy which attracts different members at different times and which involves different subgroups committing acts in furtherance of an overall plan".

§1983 Civil Rights Acts and 18 U.S.C.A. Acts state the following: "The underlying purpose of the scheme of protecting constitutional rights are to permit victims of constitutional violations to obtain redress, to provide for federal prosecution of serious constitutional violations when state criminal proceedings are ineffective for purpose of deterring violations and to strike a balance between protection of individual rights from state infringement and protection from state and local government from federal interference", 18 U.S.C.A. §§ 241, 242; U.S.C.A. – Const. Art. 2, 53; Amend. 13, 14, 5, 15, § 2: 42 U.S.C.A. §§ 1981-1982, 1985, 1988, Fed. Rules Civil Proc. Rule 28, U.S.C.A.

4. ANIT-TRUST

The Following violations constitute a legitimate Anti-Trust violation under Title 15 of the Federal Statutes. In private Anti-Trust actions, Plaintiff, in addition to proving violations and an injury, must also show that a violation and an injury must also prove that the violation was direct and material to the cause of injury suffered; however, the Plaintiff's burden in causations issues is not as heavy as the Plaintiff only needs to show a casual relation with reasonable probability to a fair degree of certainty (*Anderson Foreign Motors, Inc. v. New England Toyota Distributors, Inc.*, D.C. Mass 1979, 475. Supp.).

5. RICO

- The Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations Act (commonly referred to as RICO) is a United States federal law which provides for extended penalties for criminal acts performed as part of an ongoing criminal organization. RICO was enacted by section 901(a) of the Organized Crime Control Act of 1970, Pub. L. No. 91-452, 84 Stat. 922 (Oct. 15, 1970). RICO is codified as Chapter 96 of Title 18 of the United States Code, 18 U.S.C. § 1961 through 18 U.S.C. § 1968.

officers acted together in throwing arrestee to the ground (April 5th, 2006 and August 4th, 2006) and forcing him to take two (2) blood tests and holding him in custody". The preceding pleaded civil conspiracy claims under Pennsylvania Law.

In order to state a claim for civil conspiracy and a cause of action under Pennsylvania Law, a plaintiff must allege that two (2) or more persons agree or combine with lawful intent to do an unlawful act or to do an otherwise lawful act by unlawful means, with proof of malice with intent to injure the person, his/her property and or business. In the case of *United States v. Holck*, 389 F. Supp. 2d. 338, criminal responsibility defines single or multiple conspiracies by the following: "Governments, without committing variance between single conspiracy charges in an indictment and it's proof at trial may establish existence at continuing core conspiracy which attracts different members at different times and which involves different subgroups committing acts in furtherance of an overall plan".

§1983 Civil Rights Acts and 18 U.S.C.A. Acts state the following: "The underlying purpose of the scheme of protecting constitutional rights are to permit victims of constitutional violations to obtain redress, to provide for federal prosecution of serious constitutional violations when state criminal proceedings are ineffective for purpose of deterring violations and to strike a balance between protection of individual rights from state infringement and protection from state and local government from federal interference", 18 U.S.C.A. §§ 241, 242; U.S.C.A. – Const. Art. 2, 53; Amend. 13, 14, 5, 15, § 2: 42 U.S.C.A. §§ 1981-1982, 1985, 1988, Fed. Rules Civil Proc. Rule 28, U.S.C.A.

4. ANIT-TRUST

The Following violations constitute a legitimate Anti-Trust violation under Title 15 of the Federal Statutes. In private Anti-Trust actions, Plaintiff, in addition to proving violations and an injury, must also show that a violation and an injury must also prove that the violation was direct and material to the cause of injury suffered; however, the Plaintiff's burden in causations issues is not as heavy as the Plaintiff only needs to show a casual relation with reasonable probability to a fair degree of certainty (*Anderson Foreign Motors, Inc. v. New England Toyota Distributors, Inc.*, D.C. Mass 1979, 475. Supp.).

5. RICO

- The Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations Act (commonly referred to as RICO) is a United States federal law which provides for extended penalties for criminal acts performed as part of an ongoing criminal organization. RICO was enacted by section 901(a) of the Organized Crime Control Act of 1970, Pub. L. No. 91-452, 84 Stat. 922 (Oct. 15, 1970). RICO is codified as Chapter 96 of Title 18 of the United States Code, 18 U.S.C. § 1961 through 18 U.S.C. § 1968.

- It has been speculated that the name and acronym were selected in a sly reference to the movie *Little Caesar*, which featured a notorious gangster named "Rico." The original drafter of the bill, G. Robert Blakey, has refused to confirm or deny this.[1]

6. § 3729. False claims

FEDERAL FALSE CLAIMS ACT

The Federal False Claims Act

TITLE 31. MONEY AND FINANCE

SUBTITLE III. FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT

CHAPTER 37. CLAIMS

SUBCHAPTER III. CLAIMS AGAINST THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

31 USCS § 3729-33

§ 3729. False claims

§ 3730. Civil actions for false claims

§ 3731. False claims procedure

§ 3732. False claims jurisdiction

§ 3733. Civil investigative demands

§ 3729. False claims

7. CASE LAW FOR TORTURE AND JURISDICTION FOR COMPENSATORY DAMAGES AND REMEDIES

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA MIAMI DIVISION CASE NO. 07-21783-CIV-JORDAN

TEÓFILA OCHOA LIZARBE, in her individual capacity, and in her capacity as the personal representative of the estates of Silvestra Lizarbe Solis, Gerardo Ochoa Lizarbe, Victor Ochoa Lizarbe, Ernestina Ochoa Lizarbe, Celestino Ochoa Lizarbe, and Edwin Ochoa Lizarbe, and CIRILA PULIDO BALDEÓN, in her individual capacity, and in her capacity as the personal representative of the estates of Fortunata Baldeón Gutiérrez and Edgar Pulido Baldeón, Plaintiffs,

v.

TELMO RICARDO HURTADO HURTADO, Defendant.

THE RIGHT TO SUE FOR TORTURE

Case 1:07-cv-21783-AJ Document 32 Entered on FLSD Docket 02/29/2008 Page 6 of 31
7need "to conduct and adhere to a strict choice of law analysis." *Id.* at 422-23. In sum, the *Tachiona* court held that both federal law and international law apply to ATS and TVPA claims. The Ninth Circuit also conducted an examination of the applicable choice-of-law for damages in ATS cases, in *Alvarez-Machain v. United States* 331 F.3d 604, (9th Cir. 2003) *rev'd on other grounds*, *Sosa v. Alvarez-Machain*, 542 U.S. 692 (2004). After finding that federal common law applies to the choice-of-law determination, the court held that it should first look to the Restatement (Second) of Conflict of Laws, which states that choice of law principles in tort law are governed by the "most significant relationship" test. *Id.* at 633-34. (*citing Section 145 Restatement §6*). In order to determine what law has the most significant relationship to the tort, the Restatement looks to the following factors:

(a) the place where the injury occurred; (b) the place where the conduct causing the injury occurred; (c) the domicile, residence, the relationship, if any, between the parties is centered. *Id.* At 634. The court then articulated competing policy factors that should be considered in ATS cases.

8. JURISDICTION FOR COMPENSATORY DAMAGES AND REMEDIES

Federal Common Law on Damages

Once it has been determined that federal common law applies to the question of damages, it becomes necessary to determine how to ascertain what the federal common law of damages is, as it relates to damages under the ATS and the TVPA. In order to determine or to fashion federal common law remedies, "courts may be guided by appropriate statutes without adopting any in their entirety." See *Park v. Korean Air Lines Co.*, 1992 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 16841, 20 (S.D.N.Y. 1992) (citing *Moragne v. State Marine Lines, Inc.*, 398 U.S. 375, 406-408 (1970)); 3 This is true under both the ATS, which is simply a jurisdictional grant of that enables plaintiffs to bring claims for violations of established international law, and under the TVPA, which creates a specific cause of action for claims of torture and extrajudicial killing. In each case, absent the federal statute, plaintiffs would have no ability to sue in federal court. 4 The application of federal common law to damages under ATS and TVPA cases is also supported by legal commentators. *International Human Rights Litig. in U.S. Courts* states that in ATS litigation "[t]he remedy however, is a 'purely domestic tort remedy' governed by 'traditional, well-established concepts of federal common law.'" Beth Stephens, *International Human Rights Litigation in U.S. Courts* (Brill Publishers 2008), citing William R. Casto, *The New Federal Common Law of Tort Remedies for Violations of International Law*, 37 Rutgers L.J. 635, 641 (2006). Wright & Miller states that courts should look to a wide variety of sources, including "considerations of what rule is best designed to implement the underlying federal policy or statute involved [and] general considerations of equity jurisprudence." Wright & Miller, *Federal Practice & Procedure* § 4518. Although some courts conceptualize this broad inquiry as a choice of law analysis, they only follow choice of law principles to the extent those principles are consistent with the federal common law policy objective – enforcing the intent of the ATS. Most federal court decisions that perform any choice of law analysis do so in the context of an inquiry over other aspects of ATS law, rather than damages. See e.g. *In re Estate of Ferdinand Marcos Human Rights Litigation* (*Hilao v. Marcos*) 25 F.3d 1467, 1475 (9th Cir. 1994), cert. denied 513 U.S. 1126 (1995) (abatement); *Estate of Cabello v. Fernandez-Larios*, 157 F.Supp.2d 1345 (S.D. Fl. 2001) (standing). Many of these courts, although notably not the Eleventh Circuit, cite to the Restatement 2nd of Conflicts or refer to more traditional choice of law principles drawn from United States Supreme Court holdings such as *Lauritzen v. Larsen* 345 U.S. 571 (1953). See e.g. *Tachiona* at 420 (reviewing pre-2002 case law on choice of law issues). One outlier court based the choice of law analysis on the law of the U.S. state in which the federal court sits. *Presbyterian Church of Sudan v. Talisman Energy Inc.*, 453 F.Supp.2d 633 (S.D.N.Y. 2006) (appeal pending). But federal courts have consistently refused to be shackled by any conventional choice of law principles in ATS cases and if they conduct a choice of law analysis at all, they do so only within the larger context of the federal common law inquiry, which itself allows reference to a broad range of legal principles.

9. JUSTICE FOR VICTIMS OF TORTURE AND TERRORISM ACT

[House Report 110-844] [From the U.S. Government Publishing Office]

110th Congress Report HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES 2d Session 110-844

September 15, 2008.--Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on State of the Union and ordered to be printed Mr. Conyers, from the Committee on the Judiciary, submitted the following R E P O R T [To accompany H.R. 5167] [Including cost estimate of the Congressional Budget Office] The Committee on the Judiciary, to whom was referred the bill (H.R. 5167) to amend the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 to remove the authority of the President to waive certain provisions, having considered the same, reports favorably thereon with amendments and recommends that the bill as amended do pass.

IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES
PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Petitioner respectfully prays that a writ of certiorari issue to review the judgment below.

OPINIONS BELOW

☐ For cases from **federal courts**:

The opinion of the United States court of appeals appears at Appendix A to the petition and is

☐ reported at _____; or,
☐ has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,
☐ is unpublished.

The opinion of the United States district court appears at Appendix A to the petition and is

☐ reported at _____; or,
☐ has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,
☐ is unpublished.

☐ For cases from **state courts**:

The opinion of the highest state court to review the merits appears at Appendix _____ to the petition and is

☐ reported at _____; or,
☐ has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,
☐ is unpublished.

The opinion of the _____ court appears at Appendix _____ to the petition and is

☐ reported at _____; or,
☐ has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,
☐ is unpublished.

1.

JURISDICTION

☐ For cases from **federal courts**:

The date on which the United States Court of Appeals decided my case was February 18, 2020.

☐ No petition for rehearing was timely filed in my case.

☒ A timely petition for rehearing was denied by the United States Court of Appeals on the following date: February 18, 2020, and a copy of the order denying rehearing appears at Appendix _____.

☐ An extension of time to file the petition for a writ of certiorari was granted to and including _____ (date) on _____ (date) in Application No. A _____.

The jurisdiction of this Court is invoked under 28 U. S. C. § 1254(1).

☐ For cases from **state courts**:

The date on which the highest state court decided my case was _____.
A copy of that decision appears at Appendix _____.

☐ A timely petition for rehearing was thereafter denied on the following date: _____, and a copy of the order denying rehearing appears at Appendix _____.

☐ An extension of time to file the petition for a writ of certiorari was granted to and including _____ (date) on _____ (date) in Application No. A _____.

The jurisdiction of this Court is invoked under 28 U. S. C. § 1257(a).

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

- On February February 18, 2020 a PETITION FOR REHEARING WAS DENIED
- On February 4, 2020 a MOTION TO ENLARGE PAGES and MOTION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME TO FILE A PETITION FOR REHEARING WAS GRANTED
- On January 30, 2020 a PETITION FOR REHEARING WITH A MOTION TO ENLARGE PAGES and MOTION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME TO FILE A PETITION FOR REHEARING WAS Recorded
- On November 27, 2020 a PER CURIUM OPINION was Recorded DISMISSING THE APPEAL
- On February 25, 2019 the Case was submitted to the Panel of U.S. Third Circuit Judges McKEE, COWEN, and ROTH.
- On November 5, 2018 a PRO SE BRIEF was Recorded
- On October 19, 2018 a NOTICE OF APPEAL to The U.S. THIRD CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS was Recorded
- On October 4, 2018 in the MEMORANDUM The Honorable Judge Jeffrey Schmehl concluded the following:

For the foregoing reasons, the Court will grant Caterbone leave to proceed *in forma pauperis* and dismiss his Complaint. Caterbone will not be given leave to amend because amendment would be futile. As noted above, Caterbone has a history of filing numerous frivolous complaints regarding his allegations of government mind-control in this Court. In light of that history, the Court places Caterbone on notice that further baseless filings may result in restriction of his filing privileges. See *Abdul-Akbar v. Watson*, 901 F.2d 329,333 (3d Cir. 1990) ("When a district court is confronted with a pattern of conduct from which it can only conclude that a litigant is intentionally abusing the judicial process and will continue to do so unless restrained, we believe it is entitled to resort to its power of injunction and contempt to protect its process."). An appropriate Order follows.

- On July 24, 2018 in a related Case No. 18-2710 The Honorable Judge Jeffrey L. Schmehl wrote the following in a similar worded order:

Additionally any second amended complaint shall, as clearly and briefly as possible, state the factual basis for Caterbone's claims against each defendant, state the basis for the Court's jurisdiction over the claim, and state the relief that Caterbone seeks from this Court. Caterbone should not reassert any claims regarding the government's mind control over him or other claims that the Court has determined to be factually frivolous. If Caterbone files a second amended complaint, the Clerk of Court should not make service until so ORDERED.

On October 4, 2018 the entire MEMORANDUM by The Honorable Judge Jeffrey L. Schmehl reads as follows:

[Plaintiff Stanley J. Caterbone, a frequent *pro se* litigant in this Court, filed this apparent civil rights action against the National Security Agency ("NSA"), based primarily on allegations that the NSA has been subjecting him to mind control for three decades. (ECF No.2.) He names Advanced Media Group and Advanced Media Group, Ltd. as co-Plaintiffs. He has also filed a Motion for Leave to Proceed *In Forma Pauperis*. (ECF No.1.) For the following reasons, the Court will grant Caterbone leave to proceed *in forma pauperis* and dismiss Advanced Media Group and Advanced Media Group, Ltd. as co-Plaintiffs because, as a *pro se* litigant, Caterbone may not represent those entities in federal court. See *Rowland v. California Men's Colony, Unit II Men's Advisory Council*, 506 US. 194,201-02; *Dougherty v. Snyder*, 469 F. App'x 71, 72 (3d Cir. 2012) (per curiam). The Court will also dismiss Caterbone's Complaint See, e.g., *Caterbone v. Comm. Of Pa.*, Civ. A. No. 18-2712; *Caterbone v. Lancaster City Bureau of Police*, Civ. A. No. 18-2710; *Caterbone v. Nat'l Sec. Agency*, Civ. A. No. 17-867; *Caterbone v. Obama*, Civ. A. No. 16-4641; *Caterbone v. United States of America*, Civ. A. No. 16-4014; *Caterbone v. Fulton Fin. Corp.*, Civ. A. No. 10-1558; *Caterbone*, Civ. A. No. 09-5205; *Caterbone v. Cty. of Lancaster*, Civ. A. No. 08-2983; *Caterbone v. Lancaster Cty. Police Bureau*, Civ. A. No. 08-2982; *Caterbone v. Comm. of Pa. Dep 't of Transp. Bureau of Driver Licensing*, Civ. A. No. 08-2981; *Caterbone v. Fin. Mgmt. Group*, Civ. A. No. 06-4734; *Caterbone v. Wenger*, Civ. A. No. 06-4650; *Caterbone v. Lancaster Cty. Prison*, Civ. A. No. 05- 2288. and place him on notice that the Court may restrict his filing privileges if he continues to file frivolous lawsuits regarding his claims of government mind control.

I. FACTS

Caterbone's Complaint is voluminous and rambling, totaling 157 pages. A large portion of the Complaint includes allegations that replicate ones Caterbone has brought in previous lawsuits, including *Caterbone v. Lancaster City Bureau of Police*, Civ. A. No. 18-2710, and *Caterbone v. Nat'Sec. Agency*, Civ. A. No. 17-867.

Once again, Caterbone's Complaint contains allegations regarding CIA and FBI programs dating back to the 1940s as well as events in Caterbone's life for the past 30 years.

The Complaint recounts Caterbone's arrests and criminal prosecutions in Lancaster County and Stone Harbor, New Jersey. It is not clear how all of Caterbone's allegations relate to each other or give rise to claims against the NSA, and the Court will not recount all of them here.

To the extent any harmonizing theme can be gleaned from the Complaint, Caterbone appears to be alleging that the NSA has been working with others to conspire against him, attack him, torture him, and threaten his life and property, thereby violating various federal criminal and civil rights laws. The basis for these allegations is Caterbone's contention that, since 1987, he has been a victim of "organized stalking and/or electronic and mind manipulation torture" because of his alleged whistleblowing activities against an international defense contractor.

Among other things, Caterbone claims that government authorities are "[b]lanketing [his] dwelling and surroundings with electromagnetic energy [and] [b]ombarding [his] body with debilitating electronic and mind manipulation effects." These attacks have apparently caused Caterbone to develop telepathy. Caterbone also mentions that he has been deprived of sleep, had toxic chemicals introduced into his home, and has been stalked and mobbed *en masse*.

It appears that Caterbone reported the NSA's mind manipulation activity, as well as all of the other incidents he claims have happened, including perceived personal and business slights, to authorities, but that his concerns were not addressed. Caterbone's Complaint also vaguely mentions that he has been involuntarily committed over the years, in 1987,2006,2009, and

2010. He also mentions instances of false imprisonment that occurred in 1987 and 2006, as well as an instance where he was detained in a Mexican prison. It is unclear what relief Caterbone seeks.

II. STANDARD OF REVIEW

The Court will grant Caterbone leave to proceed *in forma pauperis* because it appears that he is incapable of paying the fees to commence this civil action. Accordingly, 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(i) and (ii) require the Court to dismiss the Complaint and Amended Complaint if they are frivolous or fails to state a claim. A complaint is frivolous if it "lacks an arguable basis either in law or in fact." *Neitzke v. Williams*, 490 U.S. 319, 325 (1989). It is legally baseless if "based on an indisputably meritless legal theory," *Deutsch v. United States*, 67 F.3d 1080, 1085 (3d Cir. 1995), and factually baseless "when the facts alleged rise to the level of the irrational or the wholly incredible." *Denton v. Hernandez*, 504 U.S. 25, 33 (1992). Moreover, "[a] court that considers whether an action is malicious must, in accordance with the definition of the term 'malicious,' engage in a subjective inquiry into the litigant's motivations at the time of the filing of the lawsuit to determine whether the action is an attempt to vex, injure or harass the defendant." *Deutsch v. United States*, 67 F.3d 1080, 1086 (3d Cir. 1995). In that regard, "a district court may dismiss a complaint as malicious if it is plainly abusive of the judicial process or merely repeats pending or previously litigated claims." *Brodzki v. CBS Sports*, Civ. A. No. 11-841,2012 WL 125281, at *1 (D. Del. Jan. 13,2012).

Whether a complaint fails to state a claim under § 1915(e)(2)(B)(ii) is governed by the same standard applicable to motions to dismiss under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b)(6), see *Tourscher v. McCullough*, 184 F.3d 236,240 (3d Cir. 1999), which requires the Court to determine whether the complaint contains "sufficient factual matter, accepted as true, to state a claim to relief that is plausible on its face." *Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, 556 U.S. 662, 678 (2009) (quotations omitted). Conclusory statements and naked assertions will not suffice. *Id.* As Caterbone is proceeding *pro se*, the Court construes his allegations liberally. *Higgs v. Att'y Gen.*, 655 F.3d 333,339 (3d Cir. 2011).

Moreover, Rule 8(a) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure requires a complaint to contain "a short a plain statement of the claim showing that the pleader is entitled to relief." A district court may *sua sponte* dismiss a complaint that does not comply with Rule 8 if "the complaint is so confused, ambiguous, vague, or otherwise unintelligible that its true substance, if any, is well disguised." *Simmons v. Abruzzo*, 49 F.3d 83,86 (2d Cir. 1995) (quotations omitted). This Court has noted that Rule 8 "requires that pleadings provide enough information to put a defendant on sufficient notice to prepare their defense and also ensure that the Court is sufficiently informed to determine the issue." *Fabian v. St. Mary's Med. Ctr.*, No. Civ. A. 16- 4741,2017 WL 3494219, at *3 (E.D. Pa. Aug. 11,2017) (quotations omitted).

III. DISCUSSION

Caterbone's claims fail for many of the reasons his previously lawsuits have not succeeded. First, and primarily, Caterbone's claims fail because they are factually frivolous. As indicated above, the general theme of Caterbone's numerous voluminous filings is that he has been the victim of telepathic intrusions, government sabotage, and harassment for approximately three decades because he acted as a whistleblower and filed various lawsuits. It appears that Caterbone has linked every adverse event in his life-arrests and involuntary commitments, medical and mental health issues, computer problems, and minor incidents of daily life-to that alleged conspiracy. His allegations appear to be based on paranoia, delusions of grandeur, irrational thoughts, and/or fantastic scenarios that courts have consistently found to lack an arguable basis in fact. 2 Accordingly, the Court will dismiss the Complaint as factually frivolous.

Similarly, Caterbone's Complaint in this action is malicious. As noted above, he has once again brought claims that are repetitious of ones he has asserted in previous lawsuits, such as *Caterbone v. Lancaster City Bureau of Police*, Civ. A. No. 18-2710, and *Caterbone v. Nat'l Sec. Agency*, Civ. A. No. 17-867. Caterbone's claims regarding government mind-control and the alleged conspiracy have been previously dismissed. The fact that his claims were previously dismissed "does not give him the right to file [another] lawsuit based on the same facts. *Sendi*

v. *NCR Com ten, Inc.*, 624 F. Supp. 1205, 1207 (B.D. Pa. 1986); see *Walton v. Eaton Corp.*, 563 F.2d 66, 71 (3d Cir. 1977) (en banc) ("[T]he court must insure that the plaintiff does not use the incorrect procedure of filing duplicative complaints for the purpose of circumventing the rules pertaining to the amendment of complaints."); *Brodzki*, 2012 WL 125281, at *1.

FOOTNOTE 2

See e.g., *DeGrazia v. F.B.I.*, 316 F. App'x 172, 172 (3d Cir. 2009) (per curiam) (concluding complaint was frivolous where plaintiff alleged that "at the age of four, he was the victim of a government-run, Nazi-designed genetic experiment which caused his body to combine with reptile DNA, and that he has since experienced harmful side effects which pose a threat to others"); *Gale v. Williams*, 154 F. App'x 494, 495 (7th Cir. 2005) (holding complaint was frivolous where plaintiff alleged that his ex-wife "remained married to him for 18 years 'to use mind control techniques' and 'inject chemicals' into his 'food and water supply' in her role as an undercover government agent on a mission to ruin his life"); *Chambers v. Dir.*, C. 1. A., No. CIV.A. 90-3321, 1990 WL 70155, at *1 (E.D. Pa. May 23, 1990) (dismissing complaint as frivolous where plaintiff alleged "that there is a grand conspiracy of the ... defendants to harass

the plaintiff through various method including electroshock therapy, telekinesis, voice synthesizers, hypnotism, mental telepathy, and cybernetics" because "the CIA is concerned about plaintiff's knowledge of the deaths of such people as Elvis Presley, Gordon Parks, Guy Lomardo, Judy Garland, Greta Garbo, Ralph Abernathy and Max Weiner").

Third, the Complaint, like many of Caterbone's previous filings, fails to comply with Rule 8 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. Among other things, the Complaint contains details about Caterbone's personal and family life, explanations of various government programs, and cites to numerous articles and statutes whose relevance is often unclear. "It is so excessively voluminous and unfocused as to be unintelligible" and "[leaves] the defendants having to guess what of the many things discussed" forms the basis for the claims against them. *Binsack v. Lackawanna Cty. Prison*, 438 F. App'x 158, 160 (3d Cir. 2011) (per curiam). For that reason as well, the Complaint is subject to dismissal.

Fourth, to the extent the Complaint can be construed as raising claims under criminal statutes, those claims fail. Criminal statutes do not generally provide a basis for a litigant's civil claims, and this Court lacks the authority to initiate criminal proceedings. See *Cent. Bank of Dover, NA. v. First Interstate Bank of Denver, NA.*, 511 U.S. 164, 190 (1994) ("We have been quite reluctant to infer a private right of action from a criminal prohibition alone[.]"); *Godfrey v. Pennsylvania*, 525 F. App'x 78,80 n.1 (3d Cir. 2013) (per curiam) ("[T]here is no federal right to require the government to initiate criminal proceedings."); *Mikhail v. Kahn*, 991 F. Supp. 2d 596,636 (E.D. Pa. 2014) ("[I]t is today beyond all reasonable doubt that the prosecution of violations of federal criminal law in federal court is a function of the federal government, not private parties, and federal courts lack the power to direct the filing of criminal charges[.]") (citations, quotations, and alteration omitted), *aff'd*, 572 F. App'x 68 (3d Cir. 2014) (per curiam). In any event, Caterbone "lacks a judicially cognizable interest in the prosecution or nonprosecution of another," and has no right to a government investigation. *Linda R.S. v. Richard D.*, 410 U.S. 614,619 (1973); see also *Boseski v. N Arlington Municipality*, 621 F. App'x 131, 135 (3d Cir. 2015) (per curiam) ("Boseski has no cognizable claim against a government entity for its failure to investigate or bring criminal charges against another individual. ").

Fifth, to the extent Caterbone raises constitutional claims pursuant to *Bivens v. Six Unknown Named Agents of Federal Bureau of Narcotics*, 403 U.S. 388 (1971), he has inappropriately sued the NSA. 3 "Absent a waiver, sovereign immunity shields the Federal Government and its agencies from suit." *F.D.IC. v. Meyer*, 510 U.S. 471, 475 (1994). Although *Bivens* creates a damages remedy against individual federal agents for certain constitutional violations, it does not support a cause of action against federal agencies, See *id.* at 486; see also *Carr. Servs. Corp. v. Malesko*, 534 U.S. 61, 71 (2001) (explaining that *Bivens* "is concerned solely with deterring the unconstitutional acts of individual officers"). Accordingly, there is no legal basis for Caterbone's claims against the NSA.

Sixth, Caterbone's claims pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1985 fail. "[T]o state a claim under 42 U.S.C. § 1985(3), a plaintiff must allege (1) a conspiracy; (2) motivated by a racial or class based discriminatory animus designed to deprive, directly or indirectly, any person or class of persons to the equal protection of the laws; (3) an act in furtherance of the conspiracy; and (4) an injury to person or property or the deprivation of any right or privilege of a citizen of the United States." *Lake v. Arnold*, 112 F.3d 682, 685 (3d Cir. 1997); *Farber v. City of Paterson*, 440 F.3d 131, 136 (3d Cir. 2006) (explaining that "§ 1985(3) defendants must have allegedly conspired against a group that has an identifiable existence independent of the fact that its members are victims of the defendants' tortious conduct"). While Caterbone suggests that the NSA and others conspired against him, he fails to mention the type of race- or class-based discrimination that is required to state a claim under § 1985(3).

FOOTNOTE3 Caterbone invokes 42 U.S.C. § 1983 in his Complaint. However, because the NSA is a federal agency, the Court construes such claims to be brought pursuant to *Bivens*. *Brown v. Philip Morris, Inc.*, 250 F.3d 789, 800 (3d Cir. 2001) ("A *Bivens* action, which is the federal equivalent of the § 1983 cause of action against state actors, will lie where the defendant has violated the plaintiffs rights under color of federal law.").

Finally, the vast majority of Caterbone's constitutional claims are time-barred. Pennsylvania's two-year statute of limitations applies to Caterbone's *Bivens* claims. See 42 Pa. Cons. Stat. § 5524; *Wallace v. Kato*, 549 U.S. 384, 387 (2007); *Napier v. Thirty or More Unidentified Fed. Agents, Employees or Officers*, 855 F.2d 1080, 1087 n.3 (3d Cir. 1988). The limitations period began to run when Caterbone "knew or should have known of the injury upon which [his] action is based." *Samerica Corp. v. City of Phila.*, 142 F.3d 582, 599 (3d Cir. 1998).

"If [a] plaintiffs claims are based on discrete acts which give rise to causes of action that can be brought individually, then the continuing violations doctrine does not serve to extend the applicable statute of limitations periods." *Anders v. Bucks Cty.*, No. CIV.A. 13-5517, 2014 WL 1924114, at *4 (E.D. Pa. May 12, 2014); see also *O'Connor v. City of Newark*, 440 F.3d 125, 127 (3d Cir. 2006). Here, it is apparent that the vast majority of conduct described in the Complaint occurred more than two years before the complaint was filed and that Caterbone knew or should have known of the basis for his claims at the time those events occurred. Accordingly, any claims based on events that took place before September 29, 2016—two years before Caterbone filed this civil action—are time-barred. Moreover, because Caterbone's claims based on events that allegedly took place after September 29, 2016 are factually frivolous and/or repetitious of claims raised in previous lawsuits, the Court concludes it would be futile to allow Caterbone to amend.

FOOTNOTE4 Caterbone also fails to state a claim under §§ 1985(2) & 1985(3), as nothing in the Complaint suggests that he was either an officer who was prevented from performing her duties or was deterred from attending a court proceeding to testify therein.

IV. CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, the Court will grant Caterbone leave to proceed *informa pauperis* and dismiss his Complaint. Caterbone will not be given leave to amend because amendment would be futile. As noted above, Caterbone has a history of filing numerous frivolous complaints regarding his allegations of government mind-control in this Court. In light of that history, the Court places Caterbone on notice that further baseless filings may result in restriction of his filing privileges. See *Abdul-Akbar v. Watson*, 901 F.2d 329, 333 (3d Cir. 1990) ("When a district court is confronted with a pattern of conduct from which it can only conclude that a litigant is intentionally abusing the judicial process and will continue to do so unless restrained, we believe it is entitled to resort to its power of injunction and contempt to protect its process."). An appropriate Order follows. BY THE COURT:

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT

ARGUMENT ONE

The First Page of THE ORIGINAL Civil Action page reads as follows:

"STAN J. CATERBONE, ADVANCED MEDIA GROUP (Fictitious Name) and ADVANCED MEDIA GROUP, Ltd., (Incorporated in the state of Pennsylvania in 1991) are filing a CIVIL ACTION COMPLAINT v. The National Security Agency, or NSA of Ft. Meade Maryland. VIOLATIONS include but are not limited to the National Surveillance Act and FISA specifically using Remote Neural Monitoring , or the remote reading and hacking of ones mind without consent. The use of these technologies is complimented with a HARASSMENT CAMPAIGN; a campaign to EXTORT INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY RIGHTS; a TORTURE CAMPAIGN; and a campaign to OBSTRUCT DUE PROCESS OF THE LAW and more specifically the PROTECTED CLAIM from 1987 to today. Due to the pattern of these crimes and the fact that the perpetrators are constantly recruiting new subgroups for the harassment and stalking campaigns, and the fact that there are many government agencies participating - violations of the RICO, or Racketeering Corruption Act are also taking place."

THE DEFENDANTS OF FEDERAL AND STATE COURTS IMPLEMENTED THE USE OF THREATS, FABRICATED MENTAL HEALTH WARRANTS, AND FALSE ARRESTS AS FAR BACK AS JUNE OF 1987 AND THE ORGANIZED PROGRAM CONTINUES TO THIS DATE IN A COHESIVE EFFORT TO OBSTRUCT JUSTICE AND PREVENT THE DEFENDANT'S NAMED HEREIN FROM THE FINANCIAL LIABILITY OF \$MILLIONS OF DOLLARS AND PUBLIC HUMILIATION.

THE CIA DID IN FACT - corruptly or by threats or force, or by any threatening letter or communication, influences, obstruct, or impedes, or endeavors to influence, obstruct, or impede, the due administration of justice, shall be (guilty of an offense)." Persons are charged under this statute based on allegations that a defendant intended to interfere with an official proceeding, by doing thins such as destroying evidence, or interfering with duties of jurors or court officers.

THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE DID IN FACT - corruptly or by threats or force, or by any threatening letter or communication, influences, obstruct, or impedes, or endeavors to influence, obstruct, or impede, the due administration of justice, shall be (guilty of an offense)." Persons are charged under this statute based on allegations that a defendant intended to interfere with an official proceeding, by doing thins such as destroying evidence, or interfering with duties of jurors or court officers.

THE LANCASTER GENERAL HOSPITAL DID IN FACT - corruptly or by threats or force, or by any threatening letter or communication, influences, obstruct, or impedes, or endeavors to influence, obstruct, or impede, the due administration of justice, shall be (guilty of an offense)." Persons are charged under this statute based on allegations that a defendant intended to interfere with an official proceeding, by doing thins such as destroying evidence, or interfering with duties of jurors or court officers.

THE FAIRMOUNT BEHAVIORAL HEALTH SYSTEM DID IN FACT - corruptly or by threats or force, or by any threatening letter or communication, influences, obstruct, or impedes, or endeavors to influence, obstruct, or impede, the due administration of justice, shall be (guilty of an offense)." Persons are charged under this statute based on allegations that a defendant intended to interfere with an official proceeding, by doing thins such as destroying evidence, or interfering with duties of jurors or court officers.

THE SOUTHERN REGIONAL POLICE DID IN FACT - corruptly or by threats or force, or by any threatening letter or communication, influences, obstruct, or impedes, or endeavors to influence, obstruct, or impede, the due administration of justice, shall be (guilty of an offense)." Persons are charged under this statute based on allegations that a defendant intended to interfere with an official proceeding, by doing thins such as destroying evidence, or interfering with duties of jurors or court officers.

FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT GROUP, LTD., DID IN FACT - corruptly or by threats or force, or by any threatening letter or communication, influences, obstruct, or impedes, or endeavors to influence, obstruct, or impede, the due administration of justice, shall be (guilty of an offense)." Persons are charged under this statute based on allegations that a defendant intended to interfere with an official proceeding, by doing thins such as destroying evidence, or interfering with duties of jurors or court officers.

MANHEIM TOWNSHIP POLICE DID IN FACT -corruptly or by threats or force, or by any threatening letter or communication, influences, obstruct, or impedes, or endeavors to influence, obstruct, or impede, the due administration of justice, shall be (guilty of an offense)." Persons are charged under this statute based on allegations that a defendant intended to interfere with an official proceeding, by doing thins such as destroying evidence, or interfering with duties of jurors or court officers.

THE LANCASTER CITY POLICE DEPARTMENT DID IN FACT - corruptly or by threats or force, or by any threatening letter or communication, influences, obstruct, or impedes, or endeavors to influence, obstruct, or impede, the due administration of justice, shall be (guilty of an offense)." Persons are charged under this statute based on allegations that a defendant intended to interfere with an official proceeding, by doing thins such as destroying evidence, or interfering with duties of jurors or court officers.

OCCUPANTS OF 1252 FREMONT STREET DID IN FACT - corruptly or by threats or force, or by any threatening letter or communication, influences, obstruct, or impedes, or endeavors to influence, obstruct, or impede, the due administration of justice, shall be (guilty of an offense)." Persons are charged under this statute based on allegations that a defendant intended to interfere with an official proceeding, by doing thins such as destroying evidence, or interfering with duties of jurors or court officers.

LANCASTER COUNTY MDJ ADAM J. WITKONIS DID IN FACT - corruptly or by threats or force, or by any threatening letter or communication, influences, obstruct, or impedes, or endeavors to influence, obstruct, or impede, the due administration of justice, shall be (guilty of an offense)." Persons are charged under this statute based on allegations that a defendant intended to interfere with an official proceeding, by doing thins such as destroying evidence, or interfering with duties of jurors or court officers.

THE PENNSYLVANIA SUPREME COURT AND THE PENNSYLVANIA SUPERIOR COURT DID IN FACT - corruptly or by threats or force, or by any threatening letter or communication, influences, obstruct, or impedes, or endeavors to influence, obstruct, or impede, the due administration of justice, shall be (guilty of an offense)." Persons are charged under this statute based on allegations that a defendant intended to interfere with an official proceeding, by doing thins such as destroying evidence, or interfering with duties of jurors or court officers.

THE LANCASTER COUNTY CLERK OF COURT DID IN FACT - corruptly or by threats or force, or by any threatening letter or communication, influences, obstruct, or impedes, or endeavors to influence, obstruct, or impede, the due administration of justice, shall be (guilty of an offense)." Persons are charged under this statute based on allegations that a defendant intended to interfere with an official proceeding, by doing thins such as destroying evidence, or interfering with duties of jurors or court officers.

THE FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION, FBI, DID IN FACT - corruptly or by threats or force, or by any threatening letter or communication, influences, obstruct, or impedes, or endeavors to influence, obstruct, or impede, the due administration of justice, shall be (guilty of an offense)." Persons are charged under this statute based on allegations that a defendant intended to interfere with an official proceeding, by doing thins such as destroying evidence, or interfering with duties of jurors or court officers.

THE LNP MEDIA GROUP DID IN FACT - corruptly or by threats or force, or by any threatening letter or communication, influences, obstruct, or impedes, or endeavors to influence, obstruct, or impede, the due administration of justice, shall be (guilty of an offense)." Persons are charged under this statute based on allegations that a defendant intended to interfere with an official proceeding, by doing thins such as destroying evidence, or interfering with duties of jurors or court officers.

WGAL-TV8 DID IN FACT - corruptly or by threats or force, or by any threatening letter or communication, influences, obstruct, or impedes, or endeavors to influence, obstruct, or impede, the due administration of justice, shall be (guilty of an offense)." Persons are charged under this statute based on allegations that a defendant intended to interfere with an official proceeding, by doing thins such as destroying evidence, or interfering with duties of jurors or court officers.

THE LANCASTER COUNTY COMMUNITY-AT-LARGE DID IN FACT - corruptly or by threats or force, or by any threatening letter or communication, influences, obstruct, or impedes, or endeavors to influence, obstruct, or impede, the due administration of justice, shall be (guilty of an offense)." Persons are charged under this statute based on allegations that a defendant intended to interfere with an official proceeding, by doing thins such as destroying evidence, or interfering with duties of jurors or court officers.

THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT DID IN FACT - corruptly or by threats or force, or by any threatening letter or communication, influences, obstruct, or impedes, or endeavors to influence, obstruct, or impede, the due administration of justice, shall be (guilty of an offense)." Persons are charged under this statute based on allegations that a defendant intended to interfere with an official proceeding, by doing thins such as destroying evidence, or interfering with duties of jurors or court officers.

ARGUMENT TWO

WRONGFUL PROSECUTIONS AND FALSE ARRESTS OF PETITIONER STAN J. CATERBONE:

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1. September 1, 1987 | Cc2706 Terroristic Threats – M1 Quashed/Dismis/Demur Sus |
| 2. September 3, 1987 | Cc2902-1 Unlawful Restraint – M1 Quashed/Dismis/Demur Sus |
| 3. September 3, 1987 | Cc3304a2 Criminal Mischief – F3 Nolle Prossed/Withdrawn |
| 4. September 3, 1987 | Cc33502 Burglary – F1 Nolle Prossed/Withdrawn |
| 5. September 3, 1987 | Cc3701a1 Robbery – F1 Nolle Prossed/Withdrawn |
| 6. September 3, 1987 | Cc3921a Theft by Unlaw Tak F3 Nolle Prossed/Withdrawn |
| 7. September 3, 1987 | Cc3933a1 Unlaw Use Comp F3 Nolle Prossed/Withdrawn |
| 8. December 5, 2006 1 | 18 §5503 §§ A2 Disorderly Conduct – Unreasonable Noise/ Withdrawn |
| 9. December 5, 2006 1 | 18 §3926 §§ A4 Theft of Services-Aquisition / Withdrawn |
| 10. December 5, 2006 1 | 18 §2709 §§ A7 Harassment Repeat In Manner/ Withdrawn |
| 11. January 18, 2007 1 | 75 § 1543 §§ A Driving While Oper Priv Susp Or Revoked / Withdrawn |
| 12. January 18, 2007 1 | 75 § 1786 §§ F Driving Without Req'd Insur / Withdrawn |
| 13. January 23, 2007 1 | 285-21d No Parking or Stopping Permitted / Withdrawn |
| 14. January 23, 2007 1 | 285-30a Meter Violation / Withdrawn |
| 15. January 23, 2007 1 | 18 § 6501 §§ A1 Scatter Rubish Upon Land / Withdrawn |
| 16. January 23, 2007 1 | 285-21d No Parking or Stopping Permitted / Withdrawn |
| 17. January 23, 2007 1 | 285-30a Meter Violation / Withdrawn |
| 18. April 30, 2007 1 | 18 § 5503 §§A4 Disorderly Conduct Hazardous/Phys Off Not Guilty |
| 19. April 30, 2007 2 | 18 § 5507 §§A Obstruction of Hwy / Not Guilty |
| 20. April 30, 2007 1 | 18 §2709 §§ A7 Harassment Repeat In Manner/ Not Guilty |
| 21. April 30, 2007 1 | 75 § 3111 §§A Disregard Traffic Control Device / Not Guilty |
| 22. May 10, 2007 M2 | 18 § 5104 Resist Arrest/Other Law Enforcement / Withdrawn |
| 23. May 10, 2007 3M1 | 18 § 1543 §§ Make Rep/Sell/Etc Off Weap / Nolle Pros |
| 24. May 29, 2007 1 | 75 § 1543 §§ A Driving While Oper Priv Susp Or Revoked / Not Guilty |
| 25. November 1, 2007 S | 75 § 3714 §§ A Careless Driving / Nolle Pros |
| 26. November 1, 2007 S | 75 § 3802 §§ A1* DUI: Gen Imp/ Inc of Driv Safely / Nolle Pros |
| 27. July 3, 2008 | TR000185-08 Driving Under Suspension By PA State Police / Erased – |
| Records Wrong | |
| 28. July 3, 2008 | TR000185-08 DUI Charge By PA State Police / Erased – Records |
| Wrong - CHARGES WERE FROM A COUNTY OUTSIDE PITTSBURG, PENNSYLVANIA, AND THE | |
| REAL DEFENDANT HAD THE SAME JULY 15 BIRTHDAY AND LAST NAME STARTING WITH CAT | |
| 29. February 2018 – harassment charge before MDJ Sponaule | |

THE FACTS OF THE FABRICATED MENTAL HEALTH RECORD OF STAN J. CATERBONE

There were a total of 4 Section 303 Court Hearings since 2006 and there was never any medications or OUTPATIENT TREATMENT PLANS ever ORDERED BY ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE, OR THE COURT. The Section 303 COURT ORDERS, by law, must be filed in the Lancaster County Courthouse Prothonotary Office.

The first PSYCHIATRIC COMMITMENT was to the BURDETTE TOMLIN HOSPITAL in Cape May County, New Jersey – The commitment lasted only 4 hours, and was a result of a fabricated suicide allegation made to the Stone Harbor Police Department.

In September of 1987 the PSYCHIATRIC COMMITMENT to then Saint Joseph Hospital, now Lancaster Regional Medical Center was the direct result of a fabricated CONDITION OF BAIL, which when discovered lead to the IMMEDIATE DISCHARGE, again with no OUTPATIENT TREATMENT PLAN or MEDICATIONS.

In February of 2005 there was a again another fabricated SUICIDE ALLEGATION, made by a patron of the Alley Kat that resulted in the false imprisonment at 220 Stone Hill Road, Conestoga, PA for approximately 2 hours by the Southern Regional Police Department, again resulted in NO PSYCHIATRIC COMMITMENT.

The next PSYCHIATRIC COMMITMENT was in April of 2006 by the Southern Regional Police to the Lancaster General Hospital, that resulted in the Discharge from my Pro Se Representation at the Section 303 Hearing, again with no OUTPATIENT TREATMENT PLAN or MEDICATIONS.

In July of 2009 I had excruciating pain from a cavity that no dentist in Lancaster County would fill. I had a commitment at a free dental clinic in New Holland only to have the commitment rescinded at the last minute after 6 hours of wait time. I visited several emergency rooms for pain medications and finally the Lancaster General Hospital took a blood sample and found the infection had spread to my blood stream. The emergency room immediately put me on an intravenous drip of antibiotics for about an hour and scheduled an appointment with Conestoga Oral Surgeons. Upon leaving I had submitted a video tape of audio only of a recording of myself in pain. Upon arriving home, the Lancaster City Police showed up with another 302 Psychiatric Commitment and took me to the Lancaster General Hospital Emergency Room. I was immediately scheduled for emergency oral surgery and taken to the Intermediate Intensive Care Unit. The next day I had emergency oral surgery to remove 2 infected teeth. During the previous 2 weeks I had taken photos of the transformation of my face from the infection. After surgery a Psychiatric Interview was done in my room in the Intermediate Intensive Care Unit – I was discharged without incident and again with no OUTPATIENT TREATMENT PLAN or MEDICATIONS. I was never even in any portion of the psychiatric care unit. UNFORTUNATELY, INSTEAD OF A \$1500.00 OUTPATIENT BILL THE LANCASTER GENERAL HOSPITAL BILLE ME SOME \$30,000.00.

The next PSYCHIATRIC COMMITMENTS were all the result of FABRICATIONS BY DETECTIVE CLARK BEARINGER OF THE LANCASTER CITY POLICE DEPARTMENT TO FAIRMOUNT HOSPITAL IN PHILADELPHIA– April of 2015; July of 2015, and February of 2016. Again with no OUTPATIENT TREATMENT PLAN or MEDICATIONS.

The 2010 OUTPATIENT TREATMENT PLAN of COUNSELING ONLY, for 3 months was a VOLUNTARY TREATMENT PLAN that was coerced after 3 Psychiatric Nurses forced

medication by needle to the buttox, and then medication for the next several days in FARIMOUNT HOSPITAL. No MEDICATIONS WERE TAKEN AFTER THE INITIAL PRESCRIPTION FROM THE HOSPITAL WAS FINISHED, WHICH ONLY LASTED A FEW WEEKS.

RECORDS AND MY OWN MEMORY CLARIFIES THAT THE LANCASTER CITY POLICE DEPARTMENT ENGAGED IN THE VERY SAME TACTICS AGAINST MY FATHER, SAMUEL CATERBONE, JR. IN THE 1960'S, WHICH RESULTED IN BOTH PSYCHIATRIC COMMITMENTS AND ELECTO-SHOCK TREATMENTS, A CLASSIC MKULTRA PROGRAM TECHNIQUE FOR BRAIN WASHING.

The VOLUNTARY decision on my part to take PSYCHIATRIC MEDICATIONS AND OUTPATIENT TREATMENT by Lancaster Psychiatrist Dr. Alber Shulz, who in 1986 was a client of mine at Financial Management Group, Ltd., who also treated my brother Sammy Caterbone, was THE DIRECT RESULT OF REPEATED REQUEST BY MY MOTHER, YOLANDA RODA CATERBONE - WHICH I MADE IN ORDER TO OBTAIN FINANCIAL BACKING, WORK, AND INCOME. MY FINANCIAL RECORD AND WORK HISTORY RECORD PROVES THIS.

ARGUMENT THREE

BACKGROUND OF PETITIONER STAN J. CATERBONE - PRO SE PETITIONER STAN J. CATERBONE is a private citizen and the majority shareholder of the United States incorporated business Advanced Media Group, Ltd., PRO SE PETITIONER STAN J. CATERBONE was a whistleblower and shareholder in 1987 involving the United States Defense Contractor International Signal & Control, Plc., known as ISC. In 1992, International Signal & Control was indicted and found guilty of among other things a Billion Dollar Fraud and export violations concerning illegally shipping cluster bomb technologies, missile defense systems, and other defense systems to foreign interests including South Africa, Iraq and Saddam Hussein. Cluster bombs and related technologies are known to have been exported to Iraq by the Chilean Arms Dealer Carlos Cardoen, a joint venture partner of International Signal & Control. The Central Intelligence Agency is confirmed to have been involved in a covert program to arm Iraq during the 1980's with close ties to International Signal & Control, which allegedly included the help of the National Security Agency, a former end user of International Signal & Control technologies under the early 1980's program Project X. A Presidential Finding in 1984 by the Bush Administration was executed to implement the program of arming Saddam Hussein and Iraq with the cluster bomb technologies. Serious allegations of these programs were the focus of investigations that included the knowledge and supervision of then appointed nominee for the Director of Central Intelligence Agency, Robert M. Gates.

Since 1987, PRO SE PETITIONER STAN J. CATERBONE has been the victim of vast civil conspiracy that started in 1987 to cover-up allegations of fraud within International Signal & Control during the negotiations and merger of International Signal & Control and Ferranti International of England. Stanley J. Caterbone alleges that warrantless surveillance was used to obstruct justice and moot his constitutional rights in an effort to divert attention away from his allegations of fraud within International Signal & Control back in 1987, and afterwards to the present as a means to deny his access to the courts for remedy and relief, and Federal False Claims Act violations. The business of Advanced Media Group has been greatly compromised and intellectual property stolen during the late 1980's and early 1990's that included information technology contracts with the United States Government.

Organized stalking and harassment began in 1987 following the public allegations of fraud within ISC. This organized stalking and harassment was enough to drive an ordinary person to suicide. As far back as the late 1980's PRO SE PETITIONER STAN J. CATERBONE knew that his mind was being read, or "remotely viewed". This was verified and confirmed when information only known to him, and never written, spoken, or typed, was repeated by others. In 1998, while soliciting the counsel of Philadelphia attorney Christina Rainville, (Rainville represented Lisa Michelle Lambert in the Laurie Show murder case), someone introduced the term remote viewing through an email. That was the last time it was an issue until 2005. The term was researched, but that was the extent of the topic. Remote Viewers may have attempted to connect in a more direct and continuous way without success.

In 2005 the U.S. SPONSORED MIND CONTROL turned into an all-out assault of mental telepathy; synthetic telepathy; and pain and torture through the use of directed energy devices and weapons that usually fire a low frequency electromagnetic energy at the targeted victim. This assault was no coincidence in that it began simultaneously with the filing of the federal action in U.S. District Court, or CATERBONE v. Lancaster County Prison, et. al., or 05-cv-2288. This assault began after the handlers remotely trained Stan J. Caterbone with mental telepathy. The main difference opposed to most other victims of this technology is that Stan J. Caterbone after being connected to some 20 or so individuals ranging from CIA Operatives to current day national newscasters and celebrities, Stan J. Caterbone remains connected 24/7 with a person who declares that she is Interscope recording artist Sheryl Crow of Kennett Missouri. Stan J. Caterbone has spent 3 years trying to validate and confirm this person without success. Most U.S. intelligence agencies refuse to cooperate, and the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the U.S. Attorney's Office refuse to comment. See attached documents for more information.

In 2006 or the beginning of 2007 PRO SE PETITIONER STAN J. CATERBONE began his extensive research into mental telepathy; mind control technologies; remote viewing; and the

CIA mind control program labeled MK ULTRA and it's subprograms.

In January of 2006, PRO SE PETITIONER STAN J. CATERBONE was detained at every airport security check point, which was during a policy of random checks, and taken out of line during travel from Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, to Houston, Texas, and on to Puerto Vallarta, Mexico. At the Houston Airport, Stanley J. Caterbone was falsely accused of carrying plastics explosives and taken to an interview room by Homeland Security officials. Stanley J. Caterbone was also detained for three days in Mexico, and was not provided with an opportunity to gain access to a flight out of the country by Mexican Officials.

Today, PRO SE PETITIONER STAN J. CATERBONE is a pro se litigant in several state and local courts, in an effort to be restored to whole since the WHISTLEBLOWING of 1987. Most notable is CATERBONE v. The National Security Agency, NSA, et. al. In the UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE THIRD CIRCUIT CASE NO. 17-1904. That case is a PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION FOR EMERGENCY RELIEF FILED TO IMMEDIATELY HALT THE OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE THAT IS BEING ADMINISTERED THROUGH THE ILLEGAL COINTELPRO PROGRAM COUPELD WITH THE TORTURE PROGRAM.

The following is a memo of a meeting with ISC executive Mr. Lawrence Resch and Mr. PRO SE PETITIONER STAN J. CATERBONE at his office at Financial Management Group, Ltd., which took place on June 23, 1987.

"Mr. Lawrence Resch, of San Clemente, California, was a long time associate of Mr. James Guerin who worked as a marketing consultant, and was an ISC executive prior to the company going public in 1982. He served as Director of Marketing and head of Lancaster operations for then defunct United Chem Con, an affiliate of ISC. He was sued by Ferranti International in 1990 for \$189 million dollars and indicted and found guilty by prosecutors for his role with ISC and served a jail term.

Upon the arrival of Mr. Larry Resch, Stan Caterbone met him in the lobby of Financial Management Group, Ltd, at which time Larry Resch said "Carl Jacobson could not attend, we had to suddenly fly him out of the country early this morning (flew to Chile)" The meeting was started with the subject of the financial difficulties of United Chem Con and possible alternatives. Larry Resch specifically addressed the possibility of moving the operations of United Chem Con to another facility, with specific regards to the Renovo Plant. Larry Resch specifically addressed the financing capabilities of Stan Caterbone, along with possible management opportunities. Larry Resch also gave financial statements and documents to Stan Caterbone for the latest fiscal year for United Chem Con. Stan Caterbone went on to allege that United Chem Con had embezzled some \$15,000,000 from the United States Government for contracts that contained improprieties. Stan Caterbone also alleged improprieties of International Signal & Control and James Guerin, with specific regards to its role in the United Chem Con, and its business activities as related to government contracts. Stan Caterbone noted that he, as a legal shareholder of International Signal & Control was concerned about improper business activities.

Larry Resch was taken by surprise by all of the above. Stan Caterbone became quite upset by the evasiveness and the lack of specifics with regards to Larry Resch's conversation. In efforts to thwart any further communication from James Guerin, United Chem Con, or International Signal & Control, Stan Caterbone demanded a retainer fee of \$10,000 before anyone contacted him again."

Today, the TRUMP ADMINISTRATION is using the old J. Edgar Hoover COINTELPRO Program while at the same time expanding the powers of local law enforcement through 3 Executive Orders in order to Militarize Local Police Departments. The following are the effects of the ILLEGAL AND LANDMARK COINTELPRO PROGRAM that is used against me:

As Contained In The Lancaster County Court Of Common Pleas Case No. 08-13373 Where

President Donald Trump Was Added To The Defendant's List On January 23, 2017 And Other State And Federal Court Cases; The Trump Administration Is Utilizing An Illegal COINTELPRO Program To Harass The Appellant, Stan J. Caterbone And Obstruct Justice By Directing Causing It Almost Impossible For The Continuation Of Those Same Civil Actions.

The Trump Administration Signed (3) Executive Orders That Broadened The Powers Of The City Of Lancaster Police Department To Coincide With The Above.

The Fact That Complainant Stan J. Caterbone's History With The Lancaster City Police Department Traces Back To The 1960'S With The Targeting Of Complainant Stan J. Caterbone's Father, Samuel Caterbone, Jr. In The Very Same Manner As The Current Targeting Of Complainant Stan J. Caterbone Today Is Reason Enough To Have Summary Judgments In All Civil Actions In Federal And State Courts Immediately Ordered.

THE TARGETING CONSISTS OF THE FOLLOWING:

- **An Unprecedented Harassment Program Carried Out By Residents, Neighbors, Stalking Groups, Law Enforcement, And Others.**
- **An Unprecedented Hacking Program Of All Electronic Equipment.**
- **Unprecedented Torture Program Utilizing Electromagnetic And Other Exotic Weapons Developed By The Department Of Defense And Intelligence Community.**
- **An Unprecedented Campaign Designed To Drain The Appellant Stan J. Caterbone Of All Cash Resources, Which Has Resulted In A Cash Position Of Some \$60,000.00 In June Of 2015 To Nothing Today.**
- **The Unprecedented Campaign Of False Statements By The Residents Of 1252 Fremont Stree And The Perjured Statements Of Lancaster City Police In Recent Criminal Summary Offenses Filed In District Magistrate Adam Witkonis Court.**
- **An Unprecedented Campaign Of Daily Harassment's And Threats By The Residents Of 1252 Fremont Street, Which Has Been Ongoing Since 2006.Un Unprecedented Campaign Of Threats Of Physical Harm In Public Spaces.**
- **The Unprecedented Campaign Of The Breaking And Entering Into The Residence Of The Complainant Stan J. Caterbone Causing Vandalism, Thefts, Poisoning Of Food, And The Strategic Placement Of Cock Roaches On A Daily Basis. This Also Involves The Theft And Manipulation Of Court Filings And Evidence.**
- **The Above Are All Facilitated And Supported With Violations Of Due Process In The Complaints To Law Enforcement.**
- **Complainant Stan J. Caterbone, Pro Seam Receiving Retaliatory Adverse And Harassing Treatment Due To The Fact That 1. , I, Complainant Stan J. Caterbone, Pro Se, Am The Amicus For Former Pennsylvania Attorney General Kathleen Kane In Case No. 3575 EDA 2016 In The Eastern District Of Superior Court, Currently In Litigation.**

THE CUMULATIVE RESULTS OF THE ABOVE LAYS THE FOUNDATION FOR AN UNPRECEDENTED LANDMARK CASE OF HUMAN RIGHTS VIOLATIONS AND ANTI-TRUST VIOLATIONS.

It is too easy for present and future administrations to abuse their power and utilize warrantless surveillance as a means of subverting and obstructing justice for those that are

engaged in Whistle-Blowing cases that concern National Security. Without the proper oversight and judicial review, a Whistle Blower can be placed on terrorist lists for malicious reasons without the knowledge or just cause. This is in direct conflict with keeping our democracy free of corruption while adhering to the spirit of the constitution in the manner our founding fathers envisioned.

Activists, Citizens, and Voters must ensure that constitutional rights of private citizens are not compromised and justice subverted through information obtained from warrantless surveillance upon which there is no just cause for any allegations or association with terrorism. Whistle-Blowers are inherently supportive of a system of checks and balances within our government that go beyond our constitutional doctrines regarding the same. Whistle-Blowers ensure that the rule of law is universally applied to all government officials in all branches of government. The Federal False Claims Act and its provisions protect individuals from abuse of power, while providing relief and remedies for those that were wronged and those that had the courage to cite a wrong.

U.S. Sponsored Mind Control Systems are also used to compliment these illegal programs to silence WHISTLEBLOWERS and others that our government recognizes as a threat to their illegal strategies and those that are seeking the TRUTH. Synthetic Telepathy Coupled with Electromagnetic Weapons used for pain have been the ELECTRONIC WEAPONS OF CHOICE by the PERPETRATORS committing these heinous crimes against, STAN J. CATERBONE since at least 2005. My father, U.S. Navy 1943 to 1946) was a victim of MK-ULTRA and experienced the same effects since at least the early 1960's and my brother, Sammy, (U.S. Air Force 1969-1971) received the same victimization through the use of the LSD experiments of the same program.

PRO SE PETITIONER STAN J. CATERBONE stated and declared that the initial time of connection with the SYNTHETIC TELEPATHY consisted of months of NON-STOP INTERROGATIONS BY MALE SUBJECTS WHO IDENTIFIED THEMSELVES AS CIA OPERATIVES. The interrogations lasted hours upon hours at a time and covered just about every aspect of AMICUS STAN J. CATERBONE'S life. The "HANDLERS", for lack of a better term, not only focused on the WHISTLEBLOWING ACTIVITIES OF ISC IN 1987, but also covered mundane everyday experiences, as a form to harass and torture.

In late spring of 2005, the "HANDLERS" introduce females to the sessions. To this day, the torture consists of the same, interrogations mixed in with harassment, sex, and humor. It is the opinion of PRO SE PETITIONER STAN J. CATERBONE, that the only way to keep from desensitizing and numbing to the harassment and pain is to experience pleasure and laughter so as to keep the magnitude of the pain at its highest level.

THIS CAN BE SUBSANTIATED AND VALIDATED BY THE FACT THAT THE SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION UNDER HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES GRANTED PRO SE APPELLANT DEBTOR STAN J. CATERBONE A DISABILITY BENEFITS IN AUGUST OF 2009 FOR SYMPTOMS AND ILLNESSES RELATED TO U.S. SPONSORED MIND CONTROL, AND IN FACT STATED IN THE AWARD LETTER THAT DISABILITY WAS DETERMINED TO BEGIN IN DECEMBER OF 2005; THE DATE A PRO SE PETITIONER STAN J. CATERBONE DECLARED THAT THE SYNTHETIC TELEPATHY HAD GONE FULL-TIME 24/7, WITHOUT INTERRUPTION, TO THIS DAY.

The NEXUS to International Signal and Control, Plc., or ISC; the CIA; the NSA; Lancaster, Pennsylvania; and U.S. Sponsored Mind Control comes through ISC Board of Director, Admiral Bobby Ray Inman. Bobby Ray Inman was the former Director of the NSA, and The Director of U.S. Naval Intelligence. Like today, when foreign police is politicized for partisan reasons, patriots and traitors are often confused as being one in the same. The operations by ISC and the respective intelligence agencies were conspired for tactical and logistical reasons that the Department of Defense and others could not find a way to communicate its objectives to Congress for approval without compromising its missions. ISC founder James Guerin and others were indicted in 1991 and sentenced to prison terms in 1992.

One must remember that the U.S. Sponsored Mind Control Programs were the direct result of the Soviet Union's accomplishments using Microwave Technologies to bombard the U.S. Embassy in Moscow as early the 1950's and the use of German Psychiatrists by Adolf Hitler in the 1940's developing psychological warfare programs. Both the German and Soviet Mind Control Programs predate that of the United States. Thus, the beginning of the Mind Control Arms Race. Just this year, the Trump Administration introduced the NEW MILITARY SPACE AGENCY, in an effort to formalize the weaponization of Space and Microwave Weapons under one agency. This will convert the Department of Defense programs and that of the U. S. Intelligence Agencies to this new Military Space Agency.

ARGUMENT FOUR

REMOTE NEURAL MONITORING: HOW THEY SPY ON YOUR THOUGHTS

Remote Neural Monitoring: How They Spy on Your Thoughts – Anonymous - CLICK ON THIS LINKS

How many times did you have thoughts that you never wanted to share with anyone, and have been constantly worried at the thought of someone ever finding out about these thoughts?

All of us have been through this process, and the new and improved technologies being developed around the world, supposedly to deal with crime and terrorism, and inadvertently intrude on one's privacy, should probably bring us all to the brink of paranoia.

These technologies are funded by governments at the highest level and some of the countries involved include USA, UK, Spain, Germany and France.

Recently, the infamous National Security Agency (NSA) of the U.S.A. has developed a very efficient method of controlling the human brain.

<https://youtu.be/ZBsIsLRHCEw>

**EDWARD SNOWDEN IN 2014 INTERVIEW WITH NBC NEWS BRIAN WILLIAMS
DISCLOSING NSA'S REMOTE NEURAL MONITORING PROGRAM LIVE ON THE AIR**

<https://youtu.be/ZBsIsLRHCEw>

This technology is called Remote Neural Monitoring (R.N.M.) and is expected to revolutionize crime detection and investigation.

R.N.M. works remotely (ever wondered why have we all been driven relentlessly towards wireless systems?) to control the brain under the objective to detect any criminal thought taking place inside the mind of a possible culprit. Inevitable question: How can you isolate a criminal thought if you do not have a comparative measure of non-criminal thoughts?

This undertaking is based on two principles:

- The research studies have shown that the humanoid intellect thinks at a speed of about 5 kilobits per second and, therefore, does not have the capability to contest with supercomputers acting via satellites, implants and biotelemetry.
- The human brain has a characteristic set of bioelectric resonance structure. By using supercomputers, the R.N.M. system can home in on it, and send messages through an embedded individual's nervous system in order to affect their performance in a preferred way.

The entire system has been developed after about 50 years (!) of neuro-electromagnetic human experimentations, claimed to be involuntary, but there is no evidence to support this claim. According to many scientists involved in this program (their names are not revealed for obvious reasons), within a few years it is expected that DNA microchips, under the guise of medical breakthroughs that will be presented to launch the disease cure processes on speed and efficiency, will be implanted in the humanoid cerebrum, which would make it inherently controllable. R.N.M. will then

have the ability to read and govern a person's emotional mental procedures along with the involuntary and visions.

At present, around the world, supercomputers are watching millions of people at the same time, with the speed of 20 terabits per second, particularly in countries like USA, Japan, Israel and a number of European countries. A similar program is supposedly under way in Russia.

How does R.N.M. work? It employs a set of programs functioning at different levels, like:

1. The signals intelligence system which applies electromagnetic frequencies (EMF), to excite the brain for the system and the electronic brain link (EBL).
2. The Brain Stimulation system that has been planned as particle emission intelligence, which means receiving information from unintentionally created electromagnetic waves in the environment. However, it is not related to radioactivity or nuclear detonation.
3. The recording machines that have electronic equipment to examine electrical action in human beings from afar. This computer-generated brain charting can always record all electrical events in the cerebrum.
4. The recording aid system deciphers individual brain maps for security purposes.

The underlining technology of this system takes under consideration that the electrical activity in the speech center of the brain, can be translated into the subject's verbal thoughts. R.N.M. can send encrypted signals to the audio cortex of the brain directly circumventing the ear. This encoding assists in detecting audio communication. It can also perform electrical mapping of the cerebrum's activity from the visual center, which is achieved by avoiding the eyes and optic nerves, consequently projecting imageries from the subject's mind onto a video display. With this visual and audio memory, both can be visualized and analyzed.

The machinery involved can, remotely and non-evasively, detect information by digitally decoding the evoked potentials in 30-50Hz, 5 mW electromagnetic emissions from the cerebrum. Evoked potentials are called the spikes and patterns created by the nerves, as they produce a shifting electrical pattern with an ever-changing magnetic instability, which then puts on a constant amount of electromagnetic waves. The interesting part about this is that the entire exercise is carried out without any physical contact with the subject.

The EMF emissions can be decoded into current thoughts and audiovisual perception, in the subject's gumption. It sends complicated cyphers and electromagnetic pulse signals to activate evoked potentials inside the mind, consequently generating sound and visual input in the neural circuits. With its speech, auditory and visual communication arrays, R.N.M. allows for a comprehensive audio-visual mind-to-mind connection or a mind-to-computer association.

The mechanism needs to decrypt the resonance frequency of each specific site to modulate the input of information in that specific location of the cerebrum.

Furthermore, R.N.M. can detect audio via microwaves, and features the broadcast of precise directives into the subconscious, producing visual disorders, illusions and instillation of words and numbers into the brain through radiation waves.

With all the given paybacks for tracing the unlawful and traitorous activities, there are

many alarms and dangers being pointed out by human rights advocates and scientists. The agencies of human rights, worldwide, have criticized the system as an affront to the basic human rights because it violates privacy and the dignity of considerations and events of life.

Several countries have opposed it and refer to it as an offence on their human and civil rights. Along with other biological concerns voiced by scientists, R.N.M. remains a controversial technology, which is being used in many countries for security maintenance and surveillance.

References:

Robert C. Gunn, PhD, Arbor, Michigan, NSA clinical psychologist currently indicted for human and Constitutional rights violations of Mind Control. Extracts from the passage of the affidavit of the indictment. Declassified documents by NSA of the MKULTRA project R.G. Malech Patent #3951134 "Apparatus and method for remotely monitoring and altering brain waves" USPTO granted 4/20/76

Patents

Try the new Google Patents, with machine-classified Google Scholar results, and Japanese and South Korean patents.

Publication number US3951134 A
Publication type Grant
Application number US 05/494,518
Publication date Apr 20, 1976
Filing date Aug 5, 1974
Priority date Aug 5, 1974
Inventors Robert G. Malech
Original Assignee Dorne & Margolin Inc.
Export Citation BiBTeX, EndNote, RefMan
Patent Citations (8), **Referenced by** (23),
Classifications (10)

External Links: USPTO, USPTO Assignment,
Espacenet

SUMMARY OF THE INVENTION

The present invention relates to apparatus and a method for monitoring brain waves wherein all components of the apparatus employed are remote from the test subject. More specifically, high frequency transmitters are operated to radiate electromagnetic energy of different frequencies through antennas which are capable of scanning the entire brain of the test subject or any desired region thereof. The signals of different frequencies penetrate the skull of the subject and impinge upon the brain where they mix to yield an interference wave modulated by radiations from the brain's natural electrical activity. The modulated interference wave is re-transmitted by the brain and received by an antenna at a remote station where it is demodulated, and processed to provide a profile of the subject's brain waves. In addition to passively monitoring his brain waves, the subject's neurological processes may be affected by transmitting to his brain, through a transmitter, compensating signals. The latter signals can be derived from the received and processed brain waves.

OBJECTS OF THE INVENTION

It is therefore an object of the invention to remotely monitor electrical activity in the entire brain or selected local regions thereof with a single measurement.

Another object is the monitoring of a subject's brain wave activity through transmission and reception of electromagnetic waves.

Still another object is to monitor brain wave activity from a position remote from the subject.

A further object is to provide a method and apparatus for affecting brain wave activity by transmitting electromagnetic signals thereto.

DESCRIPTION OF THE DRAWINGS

Other and further objects of the invention will appear from the following description and the accompanying drawings, which form part of the instant specification and which are to be read in conjunction therewith, and in which like reference numerals are used to indicate like parts in the various views;

FIG. 1 is a block diagram showing the interconnection of the components of the apparatus of the invention;

ARGUMENT FIVE

- In the case of *United States v. Holck*, 389 F. Supp. 2d. 338, criminal responsibility defines single or multiple conspiracies by the following: "Governments, without committing variance between single conspiracy charges in an indictment and it's proof at trial may establish existence at continuing core conspiracy which attracts different members at different times and which involves different subgroups committing acts in furtherance of an overall plan". This illustrates the legal analysis of the 1987 conspiracy to cover-up the International Signal & Control, Plc., whistle blowing activities.
- Under Pennsylvania Law, conspiracy may be proved by circumstantial evidence that is by acts and circumstances sufficient to warrant an inference that the unlawful combination has been in front of facts formed for the purpose charged. See *Walcker v. North Wales Boro*, 395 F. Supp. 2d. 219. In the same case the following was supported: "Arrestee's allegations that the township (Conestoga) and it's police officers were acting in concert and conspiracy and with the purpose of violating arrestee's constitutional rights by subjecting him to unreasonable force, arrest, search, and malicious prosecution and the two (2) or more officers acted together in throwing arrestee to the ground (April 5th, 2006 and August 4th, 2006) and forcing him to take two (2) blood tests and holding him in custody". The preceding pleaded civil conspiracy claims under Pennsylvania Law.
- The Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations Act (commonly referred to as RICO) is a United States federal law which provides for extended penalties for criminal acts performed as part of an ongoing criminal organization. RICO was enacted by section 901(a) of the Organized Crime Control Act of 1970, Pub. L. No. 91-452, 84 Stat. 922 (Oct. 15, 1970). RICO is codified as Chapter 96 of Title 18 of the United States Code, 18 U.S.C. § 1961 through 18 U.S.C. § 1968.
- Under RICO, a person or group who commits any two of 35 crimes—27 federal crimes and 8 state crimes—within a 10-year period and, in the opinion of the US Attorney bringing the case, has committed those crimes with similar purpose or results can be charged with racketeering. Those found guilty of racketeering can be fined up to \$25,000 and/or sentenced to 20 years in prison. In addition, the racketeer must forfeit all ill-gotten gains and interest in any business gained through a pattern of "racketeering activity." The act also contains a civil component that allows plaintiffs to sue for triple damages. When the U.S. Attorney decides to indict someone under RICO, he has the option of seeking a pre-trial restraining order or injunction to prevent the transfer of potentially forfeitable property, as well as require the defendant to put up a performance bond. This provision is intended to force a defendant to plead guilty before indictment. There is also a provision for private parties to sue. A "person damaged in his business or property" can sue one or more "racketeers." There must also be an "enterprise." The defendant(s) are not the enterprise, in other words, the defendant(s) and the enterprise are not one and the same. There must be one of four specified relationships between the defendant(s) and the enterprise. This lawsuit, like all Federal civil lawsuits, can take place in either Federal or State court.

All of the above proves the underlying allegation that the Lancaster County District Attorney's Office is a bona-fide CRIMINAL ENTERPRISE that now could definitely face

OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE, ANTI-TRUST, AND FEDERAL RICO charges. The same would be true of the Manhiem Township and Lancaster City Police Departments.

In 18 U.S.C. § 1503 OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE is defined by the CORNELL LAW SCHOOL – www.law.cornell.edu/wex/obstruction_of_justice as follows:

“whoevercorruptly or by threats or force, or by any threatening letter or communication, influences, obstruct, or impedes, or endeavors to influence, obstruct, or impede, the due administration of justice, shall be (guilty of an offense).” Persons are charged under this statute based on allegations that a defendant intended to interfere with an official proceeding, by doing things such as destroying evidence, or interfering with duties of jurors or court officers.

A person obstruct justice when they have a specific intent to obstruct or interfere with a judicial proceeding. (ALL COURT CASES, BOTH CIVIL AND CRIMINAL OF PLAINTIFF STAN J. CATERBONE) For a person to be convicted of obstruction justice, they must not only have the specific intent to obstruct the proceeding, both the person must know (1) that a proceeding was actually pending at the time; and (2) there must be a nexus between the defendant's endeavor to obstruct justice and the proceeding, and the defendant must have knowledge of this nexus.

ARGUMENT SIX

ADMIRAL BOBBY RAY INMAN, THE GO-TO GUY FOR BLACK OPS PROGRAMS AND DEFENSE CONTRACTS - In the following article by Tom Porter in 1996 documents the Bobby Ray Inman Mind Control Connection through SAIC Corporation:

Brief History Of MK-Ultra, CIA Program On Mind Control by Tom Porter ©1996 All Rights Reserved

"S.A.I.C. involvement in 1993 American Parapsychological Association meeting arrangements, via their 'Cognitive Sciences Laboratory'. Science Applications International Corporation is a big time defense contractor, has held the largest number of research contracts of any defense contractor. Bobby Ray Inman is on its board of directors, among others."

"In December 1993 President Clinton nominated Admiral Bobby Ray Inman to be Secretary of Defense. Inman served in a series of senior intelligence positions including Director of Naval Intelligence (1974-76), Vice Director of the Defense Intelligence Agency (1976-77), Director of the National Security Agency (1977-81) and Deputy Director of the Central Intelligence Agency (1981-1982). In the early 1980s Inman, then a private businessman, was named to the shadow board International Signal and Control. These boards are required for U.S. defense companies wholly or partly owned by foreigners and are supposed to guarantee that no U.S. secrets get into foreign hands.

In 1991 James Guerin, founder and chairman of International Signal and Control (ISC), pleaded guilty to selling arms to apartheid South Africa and agreed to testify against others. Ten American, seven South Africans and three South African companies were charged in the case. This case was one of the most significant U.S. violations of the of U.S. export laws and the mandatory U.N. arms embargo.

In April 1992, prior to Guerin's sentencing, Inman, wrote the judge that between 1975 and 1978 Guerin "voluntarily provided the U.S. government with information obtained during his foreign travels which was of substantial value, particular that related to the potential proliferation of nuclear weapons." Several defendants in the ISC case claimed the U.S. government knew of their sales to South Africa and that they provided information on South Africa's defense, including its nuclear weapons program. Guerin was sentenced to 15 years in jail. Guerin could have received up to 61 years.

In January 1994 Inman withdrew his nomination for Secretary of Defense. In response to his withdrawal I wrote this letter that appeared in the New York Times. - Richard Knight

**THE NEW YORK TIMES EDITORIALS/LETTERS FRIDAY JANUARY 28, 1994
South Africa Link
To the Editor:**

The withdrawal of Bobby Ray Inman's nomination for Secretary of Defense brought to public attention the case of International Signal and Control, a defense and technology company. James Guerin, the company's founder, was recently sentenced to jail for illegal arms sales to South Africa, as you report in "Inman Faced Scrutiny on Jailed Arms Dealer" (news article, Jan. 20).

As one who has followed International Signal and Control for years, I believe there are many unanswered questions in this case involving our own Government, its intelligence agencies and United States implementation of the United Nations arms embargo against South Africa.

Ties between International Signal and South Africa go back to the 1970's. In February 1976 the Department of State granted approval of a contract for the study of maritime command and control systems with Barlow Communications of South Africa. In January 1978, because of United States support for the 1977 United Nations arms embargo resolution, the State Department revoked the contract. Yet it appears International Signal continued its involvement in this project. According to the indictment of Mr. Guerin, International Signal sold South Africa inertial and land navigation systems and gyroscopes for aircraft, missiles and helicopters. International Signal also made millions of dollars in other illegal sales to South Africa including military-related technology and land mines. Did United States intelligence agencies allow International Signal to continue its illegal operations for intelligence on South Africa's nuclear and other military programs, or to support South Africa's military for other reasons?

Mr. Inman has acknowledged that as director of Naval Intelligence in the mid-70's, he knew of the first International Signal contract and was aware of later information supplied by the company on South Africa's nuclear program. Most likely, these ties had some bearing on Mr. Inman's appointment as a director on the International Signal shadow board. Such boards protect United States interests and secrets. Did Mr. Inman ask questions about large contracts going to small companies and countries like South Africa and Panama? The central question, as with the IRAN-CONTRA SCANDAL, is how to establish effective procedures to prevent United States intelligence agencies, or people working with them, from subverting laws established by Congress. If directors on shadow boards such as that of International Signal are just "window dressing," Congress should tighten the system and make directors accountable.

Congress should also examine the role of intelligence agencies in this case. Company officials say they continued providing information to the Central Intelligence Agency into the 80's, while illegal sales occurred.

Mr. Inman says the United States Government never gave Mr. Guerin permission to violate the arms embargo against South Africa. Did the C.I.A. know of these violations of the embargo? If the C.I.A. was aware and took no steps to stop the illegal sale, it was effectively a partner of International Signal in arming apartheid South Africa."

RICHARD KNIGHT

New York, Jan. 21, 1994

The writer is a research associate for the Africa Fund, a nonprofit human rights organization.

CONCLUSION


The petition for a writ of certiorari should be granted.

Respectfully submitted,

Stan J. Caterbone, Pro Se Petitioner

Date: MAY 11, 2020

Date: MAY 11, 2020

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Stan J. Caterbone', written over a horizontal line.

Stan J. Caterbone, Pro Se Litigant
Advanced Media Group
www.amgglobalentertainmentgroup.com
[Linkedin Professional Networking Profile \(click here\)](#)
[Twitter for THE ADVANCED MEDIA GROUP](#)